REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Claims 9-12 were objected to because these claims are alleged to be "substantial duplicates" of claims 1-4. While not acquiescing in this rejection, claims 9-12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as allegedly being "anticipated" by Roberts et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0088570). This rejection is respectfully traversed at least insofar as it relates to the claims as now amended.

In particular, while not acquiescing in the rejection based on Roberts et al., independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to describe that (1) the hyperlinks to an external object identified by the link analyser are replaced by new hyperlinks to respective targets on a trusted server, and (2) the content scanner is caused to scan an external object referenced by a new hyperlink on receipt of a request to retrieve an external object from one of the targets on a trusted server. Consequently, independent claims 1 and 5 explicitly call for *the external objects to be scanned on receipt of a request to retrieve an external object.* For at least this reason, independent claims 1 and 5 and the claims that depend therefrom patentably distinguish over Roberts et al.

Considering Roberts et al. in general, the disclosure relates to a system which preemptively performs scanning of external objects identified by hyperlinks in an electronic document such as a webpage before there is a request to retrieve the external object (by following the hyperlink). The stated purpose is to speed up the retrieval of the external object when the hyperlink is subsequently followed. This is achieved because it is unnecessary to scan the external object at the time the link is followed as the external object has already been preemptively scanned. Therefore Roberts et al. does not disclose that the external objects are scanned on receipt of a request to retrieve an external object, and indeed this would be contrary to the stated purpose of the preemptive scan. Thus, Roberts et al. teaches away from the above-italicized feature of claims 1 and 5.

Considering the specific disclosure of Roberts et al., the office action references paragraph 34, lines 10-18 as allegedly disclosing the replacement of hyperlinks and paragraphs

31 and 32 as disclosing the use of a content scanner. However, paragraph 34, lines 10-18 explicitly discloses replacement of a hyperlink pointing to an address containing malware by a new hyperlink pointing to a cleaned version of the data stored locally. There is no disclosure of scanning the external object on receipt of a request to retrieve the external object (i.e., when the replaced link is followed). Firstly, there is explicit disclosure of the action taken on receipt of a request to retrieve the external object (i.e., when the replaced link is followed) in paragraph 37, lines 18 to 23. This simply states that the cleaned version is supplied, there being no disclosure of scanning the external object at this time. Secondly, this is unnecessary because the new target in Roberts et al. is a cleaned version of the data, which is therefore known to be malware-free.

The remaining claims 2-4 and 6-8 are dependent on independent claims 1 and 5 and therefore patentably distinguish over Roberts et al. because of this dependency and because of the additional patentable features contained therein.

New claims 13-17 are added. These new claims find support in the original disclosure and the Examiner is invited to independently confirm that this is the case.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from claims 1 and 5, respectively, and are believed to patentably distinguish over Roberts et al. because of these dependencies and because of the additional patentable features contained therein.

Independent claims 15 and 17 each call for modifying electronic documents or e-mails by replacing identified first hyperlinks with different second hyperlinks which point to a trusted server and for scanning to be carried out in response to a request received when a second hyperlink is selected. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 5, Roberts et al. discloses no such operations.

Claim 16 depends from claim 15 and is believed to ptentably distinguish from Roberts et al. because of this dependency and because of the additional patentable features contained therein.

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____
Michael J. Shea
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100